

with chronic diseases. For the next fiscal year, however, the President has requested an increase of \$320 million, or 2.1 percent, for the National Institutes of Health.

Now, by comparison, last year this Congress increased NIH by \$1.99 billion, or 15 percent, and that is still inadequate funding when you look at all of the opportunities for research grants that come before the NIH and those which are able to be accepted. There just is not enough money to do all of the good research that needs to be done.

The President was recently reported to have remarked to a member of the other body, a Democrat, the President said, "Don't worry about our budget. The Republicans will increase NIH funding." Well, certainly we will. So much for honesty in the President's budget.

A 2.1 percent growth rate is two-tenths of a percentage point less than the projected rate of inflation. That is a growth rate less than inflation, which is in the President's budget, for attempting to cure our Nation's diseases and improve the lives of millions of Americans who suffer from disease.

What the President does under this budget game is put in a low number for NIH and put a high number for other spending, new federal spending programs that he puts in to satisfy special interests, and then criticizes those of us who say "no" to such excess spending, for budget-busting spending, and then politically the President seems to want to take credit. In reality, the President's budget says to people who seek a cure for cancer, I do not care about you.

□ 1545

For the 16 million diabetics in this country, he says, "I do not care about you." For those with Parkinson's, multiple sclerosis, Alzheimer's, lots of other diseases, he says, "Sorry, I do not care about you."

We can be sure that if this budget were proposed by the majority Congress, the administration would call it a cut in funding, and probably the media would say the same thing, that we do not care about the lives of people who are sick.

Well, in fact, we do. Both Democrats and Republicans in this Congress care deeply for NIH funding and deeply for those who are sick with chronic, debilitating diseases which affect all of us as Americans, regardless of our races or religions or genders. It is a fact of life that the government can help do something about.

So I think there should be outrage today over the President's budget game for biomedical research. Both Democrats and Republicans should rise up and say no. And I urge my colleagues to call on the President, Mr. Speaker, on this game he is playing with bio-

medical research, and anyone who cares about curing chronic disease in this country should do the same.

BUILDING OPPORTUNITIES BONUS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly three years since we passed the Nation's welfare reform law, and most news reports paint a very glowing picture. The welfare rolls are at a 30-year low; more people than ever are working; billions of surplus welfare dollars stack up in government coffers, unspent and unused. The great social experiment, the 1996 welfare reform law, is a great success, right? Right?

But, Mr. Speaker, what about the 14.5 million children still living in poverty, or the 71 percent of welfare recipients who end up in dead-end jobs that pay below the poverty line? What about the many States that get people off welfare by simply turning away people asking for help, or the States that meet their goals by shifting welfare recipients into low-paying jobs with no benefits and no career or salary ladders.

We do not hear much about these families, Mr. Speaker, because we are still thinking about welfare reform in the wrong way. We had it wrong when we set out to end welfare as we know it. Our goal should have been then and should be now to end poverty as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is not fashionable or popular to talk about making changes in the welfare law these days. But, Mr. Speaker, I would say that today is exactly the right time to be rethinking our Nation's welfare policies. With the economy booming and a surplus growing in Federal welfare accounts, States do not have to content themselves to simply get people off of welfare. States should and could be taking advantage of the opportunity they now have to invest in helping low-income families become truly self-sufficient.

Yesterday, I introduced a new bill: The Building Opportunities Bonus Act, or BOB. It will be easy to remember. BOB provides \$1 billion over five years to reward the ten States that do the best job in three key areas, key areas to getting welfare recipients in self-sufficiency. First, child care. Second, job training. And third, assistance for victims of domestic violence.

Services like these will ensure that poor children are not left behind; that welfare recipients can access good jobs, jobs actually that can weather a dip in the economy; and that battered women can get and keep jobs while keeping themselves and their families safe.

Thirty years ago, Mr. Speaker, I was a single mother on welfare. Because I

was employed, I was forced to shuffle my kids, ages one, three and five, among 13 different child care providers in a single 12-month period. I was working at the time, using my welfare check to pay for child care and health care for my family, but it was not until I had a consistent, reliable child care situation that I was able to truly grow in my job, and immediately I was able to support my family without the welfare safety net.

Every family on welfare needs quality and accessible child care. Welfare moms also need educational and training opportunities. Americans have long realized that education is the door to success. But our new welfare law has too often told welfare recipients that the only door open to them is the employees' entrance to McDonald's. Without job skills, welfare recipients are shifted into dead-end jobs, entry level jobs that pay below the poverty line. These jobs cannot support a family, and they are the first to go when the economy falters.

Many poor women struggle not just with their economic situation, but also face the harsh reality of domestic violence. Studies show that between 15 and 30 percent of welfare recipients suffer from domestic violence and from abuse. We need to address this issue head-on and make sure women suffering from domestic violence can improve first their home situation, and then their economic situation. And we do not want to trap them in jobs that are dead-end.

The sad truth is that we are nowhere close to providing enough of these services: child care, job training, and help from domestic violence. We need to give States an incentive. That is the only way welfare reform is really going to work for all Americans, so that welfare-to-work equates into true self-sufficiency.

A FAIR AND SIMPLE PLAN TO CUT TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, the American people are overtaxed, and it is time for Congress and the President to let them keep more of their hard-earned money.

This year, Federal taxes will represent 22 percent of the Gross Domestic Product. This means that the Federal tax burden is at an all-time high. With the Federal Government projected to run a budget surplus of \$2.6 trillion over the next 10 years, there is no excuse for taxing the American people at a higher rate than was necessary to win World War II.

On the opening day of the 106th Congress, I introduced a bill that cuts Federal income taxes by 10 percent across

the board. This proposal is the simplest and the fairest way to provide the American people with the tax relief that they deserve.

Instead of picking winners and losers among overtaxed Americans, this proposal increases the take-home pay of everyone who pays Federal income taxes.

We should not require taxpayers to engage in a government-preferred activity or force them to jump through multiple hoops in order to keep more of their own money. A broad-based tax cut avoids adding further complexity to the Tax Code and gives all American workers the relief that they need.

In recent years, efforts to provide the American people with significant tax relief has been derailed by the contention that cutting taxes would hurt Social Security. This has always been a shaky argument, but it does not even have a leg to stand on today. Here is some arithmetic or numbers to keep in mind.

A 10 percent across-the-board tax cut would cost the Federal Government \$743 billion over a 10-year period. This means that more than \$1.8 trillion of the \$2.6 trillion budget surplus that the Federal Government will run over the same time span would be available to strengthen Social Security.

When looking at these numbers, it becomes clear that cutting taxes and securing the future of Social Security are not mutually exclusive goals. We can do both and still have some money left over to invest in education and strengthen our national defense.

Excessive taxation is making it harder for middle-income families to get ahead. When adding State and local income taxes, or just taxes period to the Federal tax bite, the average American family ends up paying more in taxes than it is paying or spending on housing, food and shelter.

A 10 percent across-the-board income tax cut would save this average family approximately \$1,000 per year. This is money that could be saved for a down payment on a home or used to pay for college tuition or put aside for retirement.

A broad tax cut like the across-the-board tax cut that I am promoting today is best for the American economy as a whole. It will increase economic activity across the widest number of individuals, thus creating jobs, greater financial security, and giving every American a bigger piece of the pie. However Americans choose to spend their own money, I am confident that it would be put to better use by the family who earned it than by the Washington bureaucrat who yearns for it.

As the debate over how to use the budget surplus heats up, the protectors of big government will scream bloody murder about any plan to return some of the windfall to the American people.

To them I ask simply, if we cannot cut taxes when the economy is strong, the Federal Government is in the black, and taxes are at an all-time high, when can we?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support a 10 percent across-the-board tax cut.

MORE CHOICE FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express concern about an article that our friend, George Will, has in *Newsweek* this week, attacking the administration and Vice President GORE in particular for dealing with livable communities. With all due respect to the journalist, he has it exactly wrong.

There is a national grassroots movement from coast-to-coast where people are now struggling to contend with the forces of growth, sprawl, pollution and congestion to try and have more livable communities. Contrary to the columnist's assertion, it is not about forcing people to do things, it is about giving Americans more choices. Today, too many people have no choice but to be trapped in congestion, soccer moms and dads forced to be out shuttling kids around, forced to burn a gallon of gasoline to buy a gallon of milk.

What the Vice President, what the administration, what Americans across the country who are concerned about livable communities are promoting is the concept of learning from our past mistakes, organizing ourselves to make sure that our plans for the future will make our communities more livable. It is not, as some would suggest, an attack on the automobile. To the contrary, it is simply not surrendering our communities to the cars.

At a time when the Berlin Wall has fallen, when there are capitalist markets in the former Soviet Union, in China, it is time to perhaps end socialism for the car by subsidizing the automobile more than other transportation choices. Planning makes it possible for people to do more with their lives and their time.

In his article Mr. Will attacks Portland, Oregon, my hometown, as a place where we are trying to crowd people, where we are trying to have zoned-out things like big box development, to somehow force people to do things they do not want to do, calling it some sort of planner's paradise. Well, it is ironic that the city Mr. Will is attacking is held up as one of the best models in the country for working with our citizens to promote liveability, to give people more choices.

□ 1600

It is a community where we have, in fact, not sprawled as much as other

places around the country, but we have actually dramatically increased the housing stock without spreading out to farm and forest land. We have added 42 percent in population since 1979, but we have only increased the developed area 20 percent.

Some of the most attractive housing, the most valuable housing, is to be found in newly redeveloped areas with loft housing, with townhouses. In fact, they are worth more in terms of actual value than the typical single lot subdivision. It is not about crowding people together.

In Portland, like in most other communities, our neighborhoods are less densely populated today than they were 40 years ago when I was growing up. What has happened is because we have unplanned growth, exclusive reliance on the automobile, we have far more people driving and driving more miles, and as a result, it is the cars that people are upset about, not the citizens.

This has resulted from not turning over industrially-zoned land to big box retail, like a COSCO or a Wal-Mart. We have protected it for industrial jobs. Portland has added 180,000 new jobs since 1990. I would suggest that it is hardly a failure, that there is a reason why people come and look at what we have done.

Government has made many mistakes in the last 40 years that have contributed to the deterioration of the quality of life. It is time for us to take a step back, to learn from our mistakes in both government and the private sector, and plan for a better tomorrow. That is what the Vice President, the President, and not just his administration but people around the country are doing with the new livable communities movement.

I strongly urge that people support these initiatives and what they can represent for a more livable future.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS: FAITH FOR A BRIGHTER FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the subject of Catholic schools, a great gift to this country.

Catholic Schools: Faith for a Brighter Future, that is the theme for the 25th annual celebration of Catholic Schools Week January 31 through February 6, 1999, in the 10th annual National Appreciation Day for Catholic Schools February 3, 1999.

Catholic Schools Week celebrates the important role Catholic elementary and secondary schools across the country play in providing a values-added education for America's young people.